

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 MARCELA T. RAMIREZ,) Case No. 2:24-cv-07217-FLA-PVC
9)
10 Plaintiff,) **JUDGMENT**
11 vs.)
12)
13 CAROLYN COLVIN,)
14 Acting Commissioner of Social)
Security,)
15 Defendant.)
16

17 The Court hereby approves the parties' Stipulation to Voluntary Remand
18 Pursuant to Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and to Entry of Judgment
19 ("Stipulation to Remand") lodged with this Judgment of Remand, IT IS
20 HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the above-captioned
21 action is remanded to the Commissioner of Social Security for further proceedings
22 consistent with the Stipulation to Remand.¹

23 DATED: December 23, 2024



24 HON. PEDRO V. CASTILLO
25 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

26
27
28 ¹ In *Bastidas v. Chappell*, 791 F.3d 1155 (9th Cir. 2015), the Ninth Circuit held that the magistrate judge had the authority to grant the petitioner's request to dismiss two unexhausted claims in his habeas petition without the approval of a district judge, as the magistrate judge's order was simply "doing what [the] habeas petitioner has asked." Id. at 1165. While *Bastidas* is not entirely on point, the stipulation for remand and entry of judgment here is jointly made by the parties, without any compulsion from the magistrate judge. Because there appears to be no danger of undue prejudice to any party, the Court grants the request.